DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 735 HE 027 819

AUTHOR Nienhuis, Robert W.
TITLE Satisfied Faculty and Involved Chairpersons: Keys to Faculty Retention. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (19th, Tucson, AZ, November 10-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Career Change; *College Faculty; *Decision Making; *Department Heads; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Mobility; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Research Universities; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Persistence
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This study sought to identify those factors which increase a faculty member's satisfaction with, and desire to remain at, his or her institution of higher education when presented with a competing job offer. Tenured, tenure-stream, and specialist faculty (N=2,051) at a research university were surveyed. Participants were asked to rate: (1) their degree of satisfaction with each of 31 aspects of the job and (2) the importance of each of 44 factors in deciding to leave the university. In addition, 25 faculty who had received recent external job offers were interviewed regarding their decision making process as were nine department chairpersons who had discussed such external job offers with a faculty member. Six issues were identified as being factors in job satisfaction of which the most important in a decision to remain or leave were those having to do with colleagues and recognition. Two areas of involvement by the department chairperson were identified as being of critical importance for faculty retention. First, the creation of a positive climate in the department and, second, the response of the chairperson to a faculty member's announcement of a job offer (faculty members wish to be told they are valued and that every effort will be made to retain them). An appendix charts the factor loadings for both job satisfaction and reasons for leaving the university. Contains 26 references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED375135

SATSIFIED FACULTY AND INVOLVED CHAIRPERSONS: KEYS TO FACULTY RETENTION

Robert W. Nienhuis

Taylor University
Fort Wayne Campus

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
Association for the Study of Higher Education
Tucson, Arizona
November, 1994

HE 027 219

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Doubletree Hotel, Tucson, Arizona, November 10-13, 1994. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Satisfied Faculty and Involved Chairpersons:
Keys to Faculty Retention

The purpose of this study was to identify those elements which influence faculty members' decisions to remain at their present institution when offered another job opportunity. Two questions formed the basis for this study. First, what are the major elements of job satisfaction which influence faculty members to remain at their present university when given a job offer by another institution or organization? Second, what is the role of the department chairperson in a faculty member's decision to stay in his or her present position?

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

As a group, professors have been characterized as 'mobile' (Brown 1967). This is due, at least in part, to the fact that academics frequently tend to identify more strongly with their field or discipline than with a particular institution. The result of this loyalty to the discipline is academic careers built among institutions as well as within institutions (Rosenfeld and Jones 1986). It is not necessary, however, to sit passively by as faculty members leave an institution as shown by several studies and commentaries on the subject of faculty mobility (Burke 1988; Caplow and McGee 1958; Flowers and Hughes 1973; Matier 1988, 1990; Stecklein and Lathrop 1960).

This study seeks to identify the factors that increase a faculty member's satisfaction with, and desire to remain at, his or her institution when presented with a competing job offer. Numerous studies have focused on specific elements which contribute to a faculty member's sense of job satisfaction. Studies on the work environment (Austin and Gamson 1983; Bowen and Schuster 1986; Bowen and Sosa 1989), faculty vitality (Baldwin 1984, 1990; Baldwin and Blackburn 1981; Clark and Corcoran 1989; Schuster, Wheeler and

Associates 1990) and compensation (Bowen and Schuster 1986; Bowen and Sosa 1989) all have contributed to our understanding of job satisfaction. A few studies (Herzberg 1968; Matier 1988) have attempted to scan the broad range of items which can influence a faculty member's perception of his or her job and, thereby, play a role in a decision to stay or leave.

In addition, this study seeks to understand the role of the department chairperson in faculty retention. Some contend that the supervisor is often a point of focus when an employee is dissatisfied but he or she is seldom mentioned, except as the source of recognition and affirmation for successful work, when the employee is content (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman 1959). Others note that the satisfaction of faculty members, the general morale is the department, and even the productivity of individual faculty have all been linked to the leadership provided by the department chairperson (Coltrin and Glueck 1977; Glueck and Thorp 1974; Madron, Craig and Mendel 1976; Solmon and Tierney 1977).

Several studies provide us some baseline data for our study. In their seminal study on faculty mobility, Caplow and McGee (1958) argue that job satisfaction is a critical issue in faculty retention. They contend that the 'push' of academic migration is stronger than the 'pull' of a new institution (80).

Herzberg (1966) concluded his study by identifying five factors that strongly influenced job satisfaction: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and achievement. These items became known as 'satisfiers' and are directly linked to job satisfaction. At the same time, an entirely different set of factors were identified as being 'dissatisfiers,' strong determinants of job dissatisfaction: company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions.

More recently, Matier (1990) identified 33 separate items which influence faculty members' decisions to stay in their present positions. These items were then grouped into three categories: tangible benefits (cash salary, teaching/research load, etc.), intangible benefits (reputation of institution and department, etc.), and nonwork-related benefits (climate, proximity to family and friends, etc.). Matier's tangible benefits are similar to Herzberg's dissatisfiers and his intangible benefits correspond to Herzberg's satisfiers.

With these resources as our base, this study attempted to understand the elements of job satisfaction and the role of the department chairperson as they relate to a decision to remain at the university when presented a job elsewhere.

METHOD

The population for the survey portion of the study consisted of all tenured, tenure-stream, and specialist faculty members at a major midwestern research university (N=2,051; response rate =51%). The survey looked at academic appointment and general job satisfaction, the likelihood of leaving for another job, salary and benefits, dual career opportunities and constraints, and issues of institutional concern. Two parts of the survey were of particular relevance to this study.

In one question, participants were asked to use a 5-point Likert scale to indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied they felt about each of thirty-one aspects of the job. The second question was modified from Matier's (1990) survey and contained a list of forty-four factors that might be taken into account when deciding to leave the university. Respondents were again asked to use a 5-point Likert scale to indicate the relative degree of importance each

On the last page of the survey sent to each faculty member was a form which allowed them to indicate a desire to participate in a follow-up study on faculty mobility. Those faculty members who had received a job offer within the past two years, and who were willing to participate in a decision study on job offers, were asked to complete the form and return it in a separate envelope.

In addition, a letter was sent to all seventy-nine department chairpersons at the university asking whether they had engaged in a conversation with one or more of their faculty members concerning outside job offers within the past two years. Those chairpersons who had been part of such a conversation, and who were willing to talk about it, were asked to return a response-device included with the letter indicating their willingness to participate.

The result was two self-identifying samples, one of faculty (N=25) and a second of department chairpersons (n=9), who had direct involvement with external job offers and were willing to talk about the decision-making process involving those offers.

This study is descriptive in that it primarily uses qualitative methods to identify those factors which influence faculty retention. A semi-structured protocol was used to interview both faculty members and department chairpersons. By using a semi-structured interview, one can be confident of getting comparable data from numerous subjects (Bogdan and Biklen 1982). Also, the use of a semi-structured interview protocol allows the interviewer to maintain control over the general direction of the interview while allowing the interviewees to tell their stories in their own words. All field notes were transcribed into a more complete record of the interview before being submitted to comparative analysis.

RESULTS

Job Satisfaction

Overall job satisfaction among the faculty members at the university is high with 74.9% of the faculty reporting that they were "somewhat" to "very satisfied" with their job. In addition to an overall job satisfaction rating, faculty members were also asked to rate an additional thirty aspects of the work environment which influence one's satisfaction with the job. Those aspects which received the highest job satisfaction ratings (percent reporting somewhat to very satisfied) included:

The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach	92.5
My job security	86.9
My benefits, generally	78.3
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	77.5
Quality of graduate students whom I have taught here	72.3

Those aspects which received the lowest job satisfaction ratings (percent reporting somewhat to very dissatisfied) included:

Time available to work on scholarship and research	51.9
Relationship between administration and faculty at the university	51.2
Availability of support services (including clerical support)	44.4
Quality of chief administrative officers at the university	43.9
Research assistance that I receive	40.9

Factor analysis of thirty aspects of job satisfaction provided six broad areas of grouping: institutional quality, work load, institution support, instruction, career outlook and compensation. Table 1 shows the latent factors and related information and Appendix A provides the factor loading for each variable. Faculty members are generally satisfied with instruction, career outlook and compensation while greater dissatisfaction is evidenced for

institutional quality, work load and institutional support. Table 2 depicts job satisfaction levels across various faculty characteristics.

Table 1. Latent Factors for Job Satisfaction

Latent Factors	% Variance Explained	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean
Inst. Quality	26.2	.787	3.10
Work Load	8.1	.808	3.21
Inst. Support	7.1	.696	3.16
Instruction	5.2	.690	3.79
Career Outlook	4.8	.661	3.72
Compensation			3.73

Institutional Quality. Significant differences were discovered for gender (F=6.062), group (F=2.891), and interest in leaving (F=60.872). Those most satisfied with the institutional quality of the university included women, faculty members with administrative and extension appointments, and faculty who had no desire to leave the institution. Dissatisfaction with the quality of the institution was seen in those faculty members most committed to leaving.

Work Load. The faculty members most satisfied with their work load were those whose load included a 50% or more allocation to research. The most dissatisfied faculty members in relationship to work load were associate professors, women, those whose primary responsibilities were either instruction or administration, and those wanting to leave (rank: F=14.425; gender: F=35.023; group: F=24.480; and interest in leaving: F=41.094).

Institutional Support. Full professors and assistant professors found themselves satisfied with the level of institutional support, in contrast to their dissatisfied associate

Table 2. Levels of Job Satisfaction with Relation to Selected Faculty Characteristics (Means)

Characteristic	Institutional Quality	Work Load	Institutional Support	Instruction	Career Outlook	Compensation
Overall	3.10	3.21	3.16	3.79	3.72	3.73
Rank:						
Professor	3.10	3.46	3.23	3.89	3.98	3.76
Associate	3.08	2.87	2.94	3.69	3.54	3.62
Assistant	3.11	2.93	3.26	3.57	3.49	3.80
Gender:						
Male	3.07	3.36	3.26	3.82	3.49	3.74
Female	3.19	2.65	2.95	3.67	3.81	3.69
Group:						
Instruction	3.00	2.99	2.99	3.79	3.50	3.53
Research	2.10	4.01	3.47	3.80	4.02	3.76
Extension	3.27	3.02	3.03	3.72	3.56	3.98
Administration	3.35	2.99	3.32	3.89	3.91	3.99
Balance	3.08	3.18	3.14	3.76	3.75	3.77
Interest in Leaving:						
Want to go	2.67	2.75	2.75	3.49	3.28	3.36
Unsure	2.94	2.94	3.03	3.67	3.48	3.50
Want to stay	3.33	3.50	3.38	3.95	4.01	3.97

professor colleagues (F=4.524). At the same time, men, faculty members with research appointments, and faculty members planning on remaining were much more satisfied with the level of institutional support than were female faculty members, those with teaching appointments and those wanting to leave (gender: F=4.349; group: F=4.499; interest in leaving: F=29.444).

Instruction. The highest general level of job satisfaction is found in the area of instruction (mean=3.79). Greatest satisfaction levels are found among full professors (F=6.221) and faculty members planning on remaining at the university (F=27.406).

Career Outlook. Faculty members at the university are, in the main, generally satisfied with their career potential. As might be expected, full professors (i.e., those who have already achieved tenure) expressed a high degree of satisfaction in this area (F=11.136). At the same time, faculty members who intend to stay in their present position are also very satisfied with their career potential (F=48.338). Dissatisfaction in the area of career potential exists for women (F=8.319), faculty members with primary teaching or extension assignments (F=6.380) and, not surprisingly, those wanting to leave the university.

Compensation. Although salary and benefits can be a frequent topic of discussion and complaint among faculty members, most of this university's faculty members appear to be generally satisfied with compensation levels. While the difference was not significant, assistant professors report the highest level of compensation satisfaction. Only faculty members with teaching appointments and those wanting to leave had significantly lower compensation satisfaction levels (F=4.469 and F=3.943, respectively).

Deciding to Leave or Remain

Not every reason to leave an institution is equally compelling; some reasons to leave are more influential than others. Forty-four possible reasons for leaving were included in the survey. Faculty members were asked to indicate the relative degree of importance (1 = "not an important reason to leave" to 5 = "extremely important reason to leave") each reason could have in making a decision to remain or leave. Those items which were deemed to be the most important reasons to leave (percent reporting fairly to extremely important reason to leave) included:

Base salary	79.3
Research opportunities	78.9
Reputation of department	73.4
Appreciation for my work	73.1
Career advancement opportunities	72.9

A factor analysis with varimax rotation was done on the forty-four items in the "reasons to leave" portion of the survey. The result was seven categories of reasons to leave including: institutional commitment, institutional reputation, community attractiveness, work load, compensation, research support and career outlook. Table 3 shows the latent factors and related information and Appendix B provides the loading factor for each variable.

Table 3. Latent Factors for Reasons to Leave a Job

Latent Factors	% Variance Explained	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean
Institutional Commitment	36.0	.862	2.51
Community Attraction	7.2	.831	2.53
Institutional Reputation	6.4	.870	3.08
Career Outlook	4.3	.834	3.17
Work Load	3.5	.750	2.80
Research Support	3.4	.794	3.02
Compensation	2.9	.791	3.18

The use of ANOVA to compare rank, gender, group and interest in leaving of the latent factors for reasons to leave a job produced few significant differences. Rank (F=5.896) and interest in leaving (F=5.467) are important when considering **community attractiveness**. Assistant professors and those wanting to leave find the area around the university to be deficient. Rank is also a factor in **work load** (F=5.534). Both assistant and associate professors find work load to be a valid reason to leave. Finally, rank is a significant factor in both **research support** (F=4.969) and **career outlook** (F=32.016). The availability of research support and the issue of one's career are important matters to assistant professors with associate professors sharing their concern for careers.

The Process of Mental Accounting

As anyone who has been through a particularly difficult decision will be quick to tell, a simple listing of the pluses and minuses of the options is seldom sufficient to bring one to the point of a decision. While evaluating the pros and cons of a decision may be helpful, there are many intangible factors, shadings of the pros and cons, that must be factored into the equation when making an important decision. This process of "mental accounting" (Bazerman, Loewenstein and White 1992) was clearly seen in the interviews conducted with faculty members.

Interviews with faculty members revealed a number of factors which influenced a decision to remain at the university when given the opportunity to work elsewhere. Interview questions focused on retention features of the present employer, the influence of non-work factors in the decision to accept or reject an outside offer, interaction with and the response of the faculty members's department chairperson, and the job offer and the offering institution.

Promotion and Tenure. When moving from one institution to another, Allison and Long (1987) discovered that some two-thirds of all assistant professors and approximately one-half of the associate professors received a promotion in the move. However, of the six assistant and five associate professors interviewed, only one, an assistant professor, was offered a promotion as an enticement to move.

When these eleven faculty members were asked whether or not the perceived potential for promotion was a factor in deciding to stay, most responded in the affirmative. As one assistant professor put it, "In talking with my chairperson about the job offer and what (the university) had to offer me in the future, we did talk about the issues of promotion and tenure. It was, and is, the perception of my department chair, and I agree with him, that I will receive a promotion and tenure in due time. That perception was a factor in my staying."

Job Variety. Several scholars have recently called for allowing a faculty member to redesign his or her job at certain points in a career (Baldwin 1990; Schuster, Wheeler and Associates 1990). Does a potential for variety in one's job make a faculty member more likely to stay? It would appear so. Only two faculty members said that job variety was not influential in their decision to stay.

Most of the faculty interviewed indicated that their present job contained a fair measure of variety and that the variety of the job was a factor in staying at the university. "My current position," said an associate professor, "contains research, administration, and service. I would like to have the opportunity to do some teaching in coming years. I have talked about my desire with those above me and it appears that some teaching will be able to be arranged. That change is very important to me."

Institutional Resources. An educational institution is comprised of many things. Classrooms, faculty, a library, offices and support staff, research laboratories and supplies, and financial support for research and teaching all combine to make an educational institution what it is.

While acknowledging that one or more of these items did cross their mind, most faculty members did not find these to be very crucial issues. As one professor said, "Sure, these issues do play a part in the decision -- but they are not definitive."

Institutional and Departmental Reputation. Most faculty members indicated that the reputation of the university was not a major factor in the decision to stay. The reputation of the department was mentioned as an issue in remaining by 44% of those interviewed. Similarly, none of the department chairpersons felt university and department reputations to be factors in faculty retention.

Colleagues. Nearly two-thirds of the faculty members and 56% of the department chairpersons interviewed said that one's relationship with colleagues was a factor in deciding to remain at the institution. As they talked about those relationships, faculty members began to suggest several kinds of collegial relationships.

First, there is the 'affirming colleague'. Several faculty members spoke of colleagues who stopped by to express their personal hope that their friend would stay at the university. An associate professor readily acknowledged that the comments of colleagues were "very influential" in a decision to stay. "When my colleagues heard that I was considering a move, many came by and told me that they wanted me to stay. They would say things like, 'I sure wouldn't want you to leave us.' and 'We will really miss you if you leave.' It made me feel

really good to have them say those things and it made me want to stay."

Second, there is the 'professional colleague'. This colleague is highly regarded for his or her professional competency and the invigorating environment that results from that kind of relationship. An assistant professor noted the difference that this type of colleague made in his decision to stay at the university. "We have solid group of faculty in this department. They are all world-class; much better than those at the other institutions. I probably spend about one hour a day talking 'shop' with my colleagues. Those are stimulating conversations and I would hate to give them up."

The third type of colleague is what we might call the 'working colleague'. "I have been leading a research team since 1986," said one professor. "We meet on a weekly basis and have developed a solid working relationship as colleagues. It is an interdisciplinary team and a real joy to work with. In a way, that team keeps me going. We provide our own set of rewards for one another. This team was extremely influential in my decision to stay at (the university). Not only could I not bear the idea of leaving them, I couldn't imagine doing my work without them at my side."

Recognition. Alan Blinder (1990), an economist at the Brookings Institution, when asked if productivity can be raised by changing the way employees are paid, said, "It appears that changing the way workers are *treated* may boost productivity more than changing the way they are *paid*" (p. 13, emphasis his). It must be recognized that salary does not always provide adequate recognition nor does it guarantee faculty contentment.

In what would appear to be a confirmation of Blinder's assertion, the most frequently mentioned recognition desired by the faculty members, and the one most frequently missing,

in their experience, was affirmation by the department chairperson. Faculty members were quick to point out the lack of appreciation from the chairperson to his or her faculty members. "...the chair must have an awareness of the little things, morale and the power of the group come to mind. I have never had the chair sit in on one of my classes, he has never offered to assist me in the design of a course, he has never volunteered to help me become a better teacher or researcher. He doesn't criticize me and he doesn't compliment; it's like I'm being ignored."

Does recognition make a difference? It certainly does. But it doesn't have to be a big deal; it doesn't require a great deal of time, money or effort. A professor who has been here over twenty years spoke of the university practice of rewarding institutional longevity with the presentation of a service pin by the provost. "Frankly," he said, "the pin you receive is nothing; but the minute it takes to present it at the dinner is everything."

The Department Chairperson

Not all faculty members interviewed were in agreement on the issue of discussing a job offer with the department chairperson. Table 4 shows that assistant professors tend to be slightly more inclined to talk to the chairperson than either associate or full professors. Several faculty members declined to talk to the chairperson because they were not encouraged to do so.

Table 4. Did You Discuss Your Job Offer with Your Chairperson? (by rank)

	Ass't Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Total
Yes	6 (75%)	4 (66%)	7 (64%)	17
No	2 (25%)	2 (34%)	4 (36%)	8

Although most of the faculty members who had received outside job offers chose to discuss those offers with their department chairperson, only about half of them were pleased with the outcome of those conversations. Table 5 shows the level of satisfaction with the conversation by faculty rank.

Table 5. Were You Satisfied with the Response of Your Chairperson? (by rank)

	Ass't Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Total
Yes	2	2	5	9
No	4	2	2	8

The two assistant professors who felt satisfied with the response of their chairperson spoke of the strong support they received during the time of decision-making. "I can't say enough about how my chair backed me," said one assistant professor. "She supported me 110%. She made me feel good; she made me feel wanted. She made it evident from day one that, if at all possible, (the institution) would not let me go. Her support was a major factor in my decision to stay."

Despite this glowing testimonial, two-thirds of the assistant professors interviewed said they were dissatisfied with the response from their chairperson. "My chair has a reputation of not fighting for his faculty," said one assistant professor. "I didn't expect him to do much in an attempt to keep me here but I did expect him to do or say something. As it turned out, he didn't do anything at all."

The associate professors who were satisfied with the department chairperson's response were unable to point to any specific words or actions by the chairperson. That was not the case for those who were unhappy, however, as several associate professors spoke of a lack of

support from the department chairperson. One dissatisfied associate professor said, "My department chair said, 'You can stay or you can leave. You need to do what is right for you. If you stay, that's fine; and if you decide to leave, we'll just find another faculty member to take your place.' He never made any attempt to encourage my retention--and that really hurt me."

Full professors frequently spoke of a more collegial conversation with the chairperson than did the assistant and associate professors interviewed. But at least one professor was disturbed by the chairperson's response. "When I went to tell her of my offer, I received a most unexpected response, 'We will not stand in your way, we want what is best for you and your family.' I was astonished. My interpretation of her comment was: They don't give a damn whether I stay or leave."

When it comes to faculty members with job offers, the department chairpersons interviewed evidence a strong commitment to do what is best for the individual faculty member. "When a faculty member comes to me with a job offer," reports one chairperson, "we will look at the job together. Because we will have talked before about such things as career goals, I can ask questions like: If the offer is not consistent with your goals, why would you consider it? and, If the offer is consistent with your goals, why not go for it?"

This department chairperson, and most of the others that were interviewed, feel that this type of open response is best for the faculty member. Seldom, if ever, did one of the department chairpersons interviewed respond to a faculty member's announcement of a job offer with a direct affirmation of the faculty member and a statement to the effect that every effort will be made to retain that person.

CONCLUSIONS

Job Satisfaction. When combining the faculty survey with the faculty interviews, six issues were identified as being factors in job satisfaction and, therefore, related to the retaining of faculty members. Two of them, institutional resources and institutional reputation, are not terribly influential in a decision to remain or leave. Issues of promotion and tenure and job variety are somewhat important but will likely vary greatly by individual faculty member.

Most influential among the various job satisfaction factors, however, are those having to do with colleagues and recognition. Each of the three types of collegial relationship, 'affirming colleagues,' 'professional colleagues,' and 'working colleagues,' are strong forces for retention with those who spoke of a working collegiality seeming to evidence a heightened sense of commitment to remaining with their colleagues at the university.

An important element in this collegiality seems to be reducing the barriers to interdisciplinary efforts and encouraging faculty members to reach across traditional departmental boundaries to bring together a team of persons with different kinds of expertise to address issues and topics of mutual concern. Once engaged in a collaborative effort, faculty members find themselves with a heightened sense of enthusiasm for the job and a growing sense of responsibility to the team, both elements which raise the potential of retention when confronted with a job offer.

The other major factor in job satisfaction and faculty retention is that of recognition and affirmation. To acknowledge and affirm the exemplary work of an employee is not a new concept, industry has long recognized this as an important element in job satisfaction.

What may be new, however, is the high level of importance this seems to be accorded by the professional educational community.

The major problem seems to be that, among many department chairpersons, the value of and ability to affirm and commend is either unknown or unpracticed. Short notes and public compliments take little time but are extremely effective in making faculty feel appreciated and valued and may well make a faculty member less likely to be attracted by an outside job offer.

The Department Chairperson. Two areas of involvement by the department chairperson seem to be of critical importance if faculty retention is the desired goal. First is the creation of a positive climate in the department. Faculty members spoke positively of the new department chairperson who, soon after taking office, would stop by the lab to inquire of a faculty member's research or would take the time to ask about a class being taught. Unfortunately most department chairpersons fail to make these types of visits on a continuing basis. Yet, the creation of climate is essentially the responsibility of the department chairperson and familiarity with one's faculty and their interests is an essential part of creating that climate.

The initial response to a faculty member's announcement of a job offer is the second critical point for the department chairperson. Generally, department chairpersons want to assist the growth and development of their faculty members. Thus, when a faculty member comes with news of a job offer, the chairperson may respond by asking questions rather than making statements.

What many faculty members want to hear, when they inform the department

chairperson of an offer, is that they are valued and wanted and that every effort will be made to retain them in. Instead, what they often hear is that the chairperson wants what is best for the faculty member and that he or she will not stand in the way as they explore this opportunity. It is not hard to see how, despite the best of intention on the part of the chairperson, this message can be perceived by the faculty member as a lack of interest in retention by the chairperson.

It will be to the advantage of the institution, the department chairperson and the faculty if more time were spent to prepare and equip department chairpersons for their work as leaders and managers. Department chairpersons need assistance in knowing how to create an environment which will maximize the productivity of the faculty and enhance their collegiality.

Department chairpersons need to be made aware of the value of affirmation and recognition in general, and they then need to be informed how to provide them. If department chairpersons are alerted to the value of affirmation, and if they are taught how to provide that affirmation, then the faculty members will be much less likely to be attracted elsewhere because of not feeling valued or appreciated.

Much immediate benefit could also be realized by working with the department chairperson on how to respond to the faculty member who comes with news of an outside job offer. When talking with those faculty members the institution wants to retain, the chairperson must learn how to be both affirming and open when responding to the news of a job offer. This is a critical time to affirm, not alienate, a faculty member.

This study has identified several elements which can be influential in retaining faculty

members who receive job offers from other institutions and organizations. In the midst of all this information, one thing is certain: faculty retention is an on-going process of creating an environment which fosters collegiality and in which every person feels valued.

Appendix A

Factor Loadings for Latent Characteristics of Job Satisfaction

	Institutional Quality	Work Assignment	Support Services	Teaching/ Instruction	Career Outlook
% Variance Explained	26.2	8.1	7.1	5.2	4.8
Reputation of MSU	.5994				
Institutional Mission	.6282				
Chief Administrative Officers	.7005				
Faculty Leadership	.6584				
Faculty-Administration Relations	.7663				
Faculty Cooperation	.5842				
Cronbach's Alpha = .787					
Work Load: General		.7218			
Time for Research/Scholarship		.8100			
Mix of Duties (Instruction, Research, Administration and Service)		.7315			
Time to Work with Students		.6258			
Cronbach's Alpha = .808					
Availability of Support Services			.6210		
Availability of Equipment			.6395		
Research Assistance			.6025		
Cooperation of Support Staff			.5446		
Quality of Research Facilities			.6239		
Cronbach's Alpha = .696					

Appendix A (cont'd).

	Institutional Quality	Work Assignment	Support Services	Teaching/ Instruction	Career Outlook
Content of Classes				.7700	
Ability to Select Classes to Teach				.7107	
Teaching Assistance				.5917	
Quality of Graduate Students				.6022	
Quality of Undergraduate Students				.4960	
Cronbach's Alpha = .690					
Job Security					.5427
Ability to Make Non-instructional Decisions About the Job					.5939
Advancement Opportunity					.5439
Opportunities for Professional Growth					.4970
Departmental Leadership					.6000
Cronbach's Alpha = .661					

Appendix B

Factor Loadings for Latent Characteristics of Reasons to Leave the University

	Institutional Commitment	Institutional Reputation	Community Attraction	Work Load	Compensation	Research Support	Career Outlook
% Variance Explained	36.0	6.4	7.2	3.5	2.9	3.4	4.3
Rapport with Univ. Leadership	.72589						
Influence in College	.68051						
Rapport with College Leaders	.79385						
Influence in Institution	.73580						
Loyalty	.54714						
Institutional Mission	.52290						
Influence in Dept.	.54447						
Cronbach's Alpha = .8620							
Reputation of MSU		.75085					
Reputation of Associates		.68647					
Reputation of Department		.75222					
Competence of Colleagues		.66160					
Congeniality of Colleagues		.41963					
Cronbach's Alpha = .8701							
Geographic Considerations			.87260				
Cultural/Social Opportunities			.81508				
Climate			.81437				
Housing Costs			.65086				
Family & Friends			.53649				
Spousal Career			.50339				
Cronbach's Alpha = .8307							

Appendix B (cont'd)..

	Institutional Commitment	Institutional Reputation	Community Attraction	Work Load	Compensation	Research Support	Career Outlook
Service Load				.61541			
Administrative Load				.68734			
Publishing				.44060			
Teaching Load/Assign.				.57422			
Research Load				.54108			
Cronbach's Alpha = .7498							
Salary					.69629		
Benefits					.40481		
Merit Pay					.71847		
Cronbach's Alpha = .7905							
External Fund Availability						.79107	
Library Facilities						.45078	
Research Facilities						.68107	
Research Opportunities/ Internal Fund Availability						.75849	
Cronbach's Alpha = .7936							
Job Security (Tenure)							.62771
Departmental Leadership							.53889
Promotion							.79473
Career Advancement							.69814
Appreciation for Work							.57422
Cronbach's Alpha = .8338							

REFERENCES

Allison, P. D., and J. S. Long. 1987. Interuniversity mobility of academic scientists. *American Sociological Review* 52 (Oct.): 643-652.

Austin, A. E., and Z. F. Gamson. 1983. *Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education research Report No. 10, Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Baldwin, R. G. 1990. Faculty vitality beyond the research university. *Journal of Higher Education* 61(2): 160-180.

Baldwin, R. G. 1984. The changing development needs of an aging professoriate. In C. M. N. Mehrotra (ed.), *Teaching and Aging.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

Baldwin, R. G., and R. T. Blackburn. 1981. The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education. *Journal of Higher Education* 52(6): 598-614.

Bazerman, M. H., G. F. Loewenstein, and S. B. White. 1992. Reversals of preference in allocation decisions: Judging an alternative versus choosing among alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37 (June): 220-240.

Blinder, A. S. (ed.) 1990. Paying for productivity: A look at the evidence. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution. Quoted in J. N. Baron and K. S. Cook. Progress and outcome: Perspectives on the distribution of rewards in organizations, 191-197. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37 (June), 1992.

Bogdan, R. C., and S. K. Biklen. 1982. *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Bowen, H. R., and J. H. Schuster. 1986. *American professors: A national resource imperiled.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowen, H. R., and J. A. Sosa. 1989. *Prospects for faculty in the arts and sciences: A study of factors affecting demand and supply, 1987-2012.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, D. G. 1967. *The mobile professors.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Burke, D. L. 1988. *A new academic marketplace.* New York: Greenwood Press.

Caplow, T., and R. J. McGee. 1958. *The academic marketplace.* New York: Basic Books.

Clark, S. M., and M. E. Corcoran. 1989. Faculty Renewal and Change. In G. C. Lozier and M. J. Dooris (eds.), *Managing faculty resources.* New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 63. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

Coltrin, S., and W. F. Glueck. 1977. Effect of leadership roles on satisfaction and productivity of university research professors. *Academy of Management Journal* 20(1): 101-116.

Flowers, V. S., and C. L. Hughes. 1973. Why employees stay. *Harvard Business Review* 4(July/August): 49-60.

Glueck, W. F., and C. D. Thorp. 1974. The role of the academic administrator in research professors' satisfaction and productivity. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 10(1): 72-90.

Herzberg, F. 1966. *Work and the nature of man.* Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Co.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, and B. B. Snyderman. 1959. *The motivation to work.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Madron, T. M., J. R. Craig, and R. M. Mendel. 1976. Departmental morale as a function of the perceived performance of department heads. *Research in Higher Education* 5: 83-94.

Matier, M. W. 1990. Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. *Research in Higher Education* 31(1): 39-60.

Matier, M. W. 1988. Factors influencing faculty migration. Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Phoenix, AZ.

Rosenfeld, R. A., and J. A. Jones. 1986. Institutional mobility among academics: The case of psychologists. *Sociology of Education* 59: 212-226.

Schuster, J. H., D. W. Wheeler, and Associates. 1990. *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

Solmon, L. C., and M. L. Tierney. 1977. Determinants of job satisfaction among college Administrators. *Journal of Higher Education* 48(4): 412-431.

Stecklein, J. E., and R. L. Lathrop. 1960. *Faculty attraction and retention: Factors affecting faculty mobility at the University of Minnesota.* Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota.